

(ii) Assume the same facts as in (i), except that the taxpayer had not included the payments in any return and had not paid a tax thereon. No adjustment would be authorized under section 1312(3)(A) with respect to the year 1950. If the taxpayer, however, had paid a deficiency asserted for 1951 based upon the inclusion of the payments in 1951 income and thereafter successfully sued for refund thereof, an adjustment would be authorized with respect to the year 1950. (See paragraph (b) of this section for circumstances under which correction is authorized with respect to items not included in income and on which a tax was not paid.)

*Example 2.* A father and son conducted a partnership business, each being entitled to one-half of the net profits. The father included the entire net income of the partnership in his return for 1948, and the son included no portion of this income in his return for that year. Shortly before the expiration of the period of limitations with respect to deficiency assessments and refund claims for both father and son for 1948, the father filed a claim for refund of that portion of his 1948 tax attributable to the half of the partnership income which should have been included in the son's return. The court sustains the claim for refund in 1955. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the son's tax for 1948.

(b) *Items not included in income and with respect to which the tax was not paid.* (1) Paragraph (3)(B) of section 1312 applies if the determination requires the exclusion from gross income of an item not included in a return filed by the taxpayer and with respect to which a tax was not paid, but which is includible in the gross income of the same taxpayer for another taxable year, or in the gross income of a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year. This is one of the two circumstances in which the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not a requirement for an adjustment, but the requirements in paragraph (a) of § 1.1311(b)-2 must be fulfilled (correction not barred at time of erroneous action).

(2) The application of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph may be illustrated by the following examples:

*Example 1.* The taxpayer, A, who computes his income by use of the accrual method of accounting, performed in 1949 services for which he received payments in 1949 and 1950. He did not include in his return for either 1949 or 1950 the payments which he received in 1950, and he paid no tax with respect to such payments. In 1952 the Commissioner

sent a notice of deficiency to A with respect to the year 1949, contending that A should have included all of such payments in his return for that year. A contested the deficiency on the basis that in 1949 he had no accruable right to the payments which he received in 1950. In 1955 (after the expiration of the period of limitations for assessing deficiencies with respect to 1950), the Tax Court sustains A's position. The Commissioner may assess a deficiency for 1950, since a deficiency assessment for that year was not barred when he sent the notice of deficiency with respect to 1949.

*Example 2.* B and C were partners in 1950, each being entitled to one-half of the profits of the partnership business. During 1950, B received an item of income which he treated as partnership income so that his return for that year reflected only 50 percent of such item. C, however, included no part of such item in any return and paid no tax with respect thereto. In 1952, the Commissioner sent to C a notice of deficiency with respect to 1950, contending that his return for that year should have reflected 50 percent of such item. C contested the deficiency on the basis that such item was not partnership income. In 1955, after the expiration of the period of limitations for assessing deficiencies with respect to 1950, the Tax Court sustained C's position. The Commissioner may assess a deficiency against B with respect to 1950 requiring him to include the entire amount of such item in his income since assessment of the deficiency was not barred when the Commissioner sent the notice of deficiency with respect to such item to C.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

#### § 1.1312-4 Double disallowance of a deduction or credit.

(a) Paragraph (4) of section 1312 applies if the determination disallows a deduction or credit which should have been, but was not, allowed to the same taxpayer for another taxable year or to a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year. This is one of the two circumstances in which the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not a requirement for an adjustment but the requirements in paragraph (b) of § 1.1311(b)-2 must be fulfilled (correction not barred at time of erroneous action).

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

*Example 1.* The taxpayer, A, who computes his income by use of the accrual method of accounting, deducted in his return for the taxable year 1951 an item of expense which

he paid in such year. At the time A filed his return for 1951, the statute of limitations for 1950 had not expired. Subsequently, the Commissioner asserted a deficiency for 1951 based on the position that the liability for such expense should have been accrued for the taxable year 1950. In 1955, after the period of limitations on refunds for 1950 had expired, there was a determination by the Tax Court disallowing such deduction for the taxable year 1951. A is entitled to an adjustment for the taxable year 1950. However, if such liability should have been accrued for the taxable year 1946 instead of 1950, A would not be entitled to an adjustment, if a credit or refund with respect to 1946 was already barred when he deducted such expense for the taxable year 1951.

*Example 2.* The taxpayer, B, in his return for 1951 claimed a deduction for a charitable contribution. The Commissioner asserted a deficiency for such year contending that 50 percent of the deduction should be disallowed, since the contribution was made from community property 50 percent of which was attributable to B's spouse. The deficiency is sustained by the Tax Court in 1956, subsequent to the period of limitations within which B's spouse could claim a refund with respect to 1951. An adjustment is permitted to B's spouse, a related taxpayer, since a refund attributable to a deduction by her of such contribution was not barred when B claimed the deduction.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

**§ 1.1312-5 Correlative deductions and inclusions for trusts or estates and legatees, beneficiaries, or heirs.**

(a) Paragraph (5) of section 1312 applies to distributions by a trust or an estate to the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees. If the determination relates to the amount of the deduction allowed by sections 651 and 661 or the inclusion in taxable income of the beneficiary required by sections 652 and 662 (including amounts falling within subpart D, subchapter J, chapter 1 of the Code, relating to treatment of excess distributions by trusts), or if the determination relates to the additional deduction (or inclusion) specified in section 162 (b) and (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (or the corresponding provisions of a prior revenue act), with respect to amounts paid, credited, or required to be distributed to the beneficiaries, heirs, and legatees, and such determination requires:

(1) The allowance to the estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously omit-

ted or excluded from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(2) The inclusion of such amounts in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously disallowed to or omitted by the estate or trust; or

(3) The disallowance to an estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously included in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(4) The exclusion of such amounts from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously allowed to the estate or trust.

(b) The application of paragraph (a)(1) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* For the taxable year 1954, a trustee, directed by the trust instrument to accumulate the trust income, made no distribution to the beneficiary and returned the entire income as taxable to the trust. Accordingly the beneficiary did not include the trust income in his return for the year 1954. In 1957, a State court holds invalid the clause directing accumulation and determines that the income is required to be currently distributed. It also rules that certain extraordinary dividends which the trustee in good faith allocated to corpus in 1954 were properly allocable to income. In 1958, the trustee, relying upon the court decision, files a claim for refund of the tax paid on behalf of the trust for the year 1954 and thereafter files a suit in the District Court. The claim is sustained by the court (except as to the tax on the extraordinary dividends) in 1959 after the expiration of the period of limitations upon deficiency assessments against the beneficiary for the year 1954. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the beneficiary's tax for the year 1954. The treatment of the distribution to the beneficiary of the extraordinary dividends shall be determined under subpart D of subchapter J.

(c) The application of paragraph (a)(2) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* Assume the same facts as in the example in paragraph (b) of this section, except that, instead of the trustee's filing a refund claim, the Commissioner, relying upon the decision of the State court, asserts a deficiency against the beneficiary for 1954. The deficiency is sustained by final decision of the Tax Court of the United States in 1959, after the expiration of the period for filing claim for refund on behalf of the trust for